BACONIANA

VOL. XXV. No. 98. JANUARY, 1941.

EDITORIAL.

DR. W. S. MELSOME has been appointed joint Editor of BACONIANA in the place of the late Mr. B. G. Theobald.

Dr. Melsome's knowledge of the work of Francis Bacon and his contemporaries can only be described as encyclopaedic and his series of articles in recent volumes of BACONIANA have attracted widespread attention.

To expect people to retain interest in literary problems in the face of such events as are now convulsing the world seems perhaps to be futile. *The Times*, however, considers the recent discovery of marginalia alleged to have been written by Shakespeare, in a copy of Hall's *Chronicles* deserving of several columns, even in these days of restricted space; Messrs. John Murray & Sons have reprinted Dr. F. S. Boas' *Shakespeare and his Predecessors*, a large volume of nearly 600 pages. Dr. G. B. Harrison studies the development of the stage in *Elizabethan Plays and Players*, and Dr. Reynolds is responsible for a work on a similar subject, *The Staging of Elizabethan Plays*, in the confidence presumably of finding purchasers, though the bombs never drop so thickly around us. It is surely pleasant occasionally when even the least likely subjects associate themselves with it, to turn to one which has not the remotest connection with the "contumelious, beastly, mad-brained war" the "son of hell." "Over the external world and its physical manifestations" wrote Grant Lewis, "we have little enough control. We must do, bear, endure, observe, live through whatever comes . . . but even in the presence of what looks like the worst of all possible worlds, there remains the world within,

for each one of us to cultivate as suits his needs and desires."

The article entitled *Shakspere Not Shakespeare* was submitted to *Harper's Magazine* as a reply to one by Professor Campbell in the July issue, but it was not published, the editors writing they were besieged with requests—chiefly from Oxfordians—to print a rejoinder, but they could not (because their schedule was so crowded and disrupted owing to the war) stage a debate on what is merely a literary theme and one that is very old and already pretty well thrashed out.

There is always, apparently, room for the orthodox, even in time of war, but none for those who would challenge their credulity.

Professor Campbell is Professor of English in the Graduate School at Columbia University, U.S.A. Shakespeare and other dramatists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are, according to *Harper's Magazine*, a speciality of his and his most recent volume, *Comical Satyre and Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida."* is an attempt to throw some light on Shakespeare's purpose in writing the play.

Professor Campbell was educated at Michigan and Harvard and taught English at the Naval Academy and at Wisconsin, Michigan, and Columbia. From 1934 to 1937 he was a Research Associate at the Huntington Library.

The late Mr. B. G. Theobald left the M.S. of the article which appears on page 145, with Mr. Alfred Dodd for the purposes of the latter's recently published *Marriage of Queen Elizabeth*, reviewed in this issue of BACONIANA.

Mr. Theobald had prepared for publication an elaborate demonstration (working on the same principles) of signatures in cipher which appear in the long inscription upon the tomb of Dr. William Rawley (Francis Bacon's chaplain and literary executor) at Landbeach near Cambridge. Mr. Theobald's method is, of course, well known: he

applied it with really astonishing industry and ingenuity to scores of title pages, etc., of Elizabethan books, and there is no doubt whatever that the results constitute a remarkable literary curiosity. He concludes his article with these words: "The sceptic is quite welcome to call these conjectures far fetched if he pleases: but, having seen so many examples of the subtlety and ingenuity of these old cryptographers, I am inclined to believe they were all part of a design. All that an enquirer has to do is to ask himself whether they are merely fortuitous. The epitaph has responded to every test applied and for my part I do not believe the long arm of coincidence can be stretched as fas as to discredit my demonstration." Although the M.S. is one of many pages, and is accompanied by a photograph of the tombstone, we hope to publish it in the next issue of BACONIANA.

TO THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

When wasteful war shall statues overturn,
And broils root out the work of masonry,
Nor Mars, his sword, nor war's quick fire shall burn
The living record of your memory.
'Gainst death and all-oblivious enmity
Shall you pace forth: your praise shall still find room
Even in the eyes of all posterity
That wear this world out to the ending doom.

Sonnet LV.

Though we seemed dead we did not sleep; advantage is a better soldier than rashness . . . .

Now we speak upon our cue, and our voice is imperial.

Henry V, III. 5.

SHAKSPERE, NOT "SHAKESPEARE."

By Francis E. C. Habgood.

PROFESSOR CAMPBELL'S article in the July "Harper's" relieves, if it does no more, those who think that Shakspere was not Shakespeare—anti-Stratfordians, as the Professor calls them,—from the stigma of hopeless insanity; the sceptics are no longer a positive disgrace to literature, unworthy of serious attention from anyone but students of intellectual aberration and whose proper domicile is a madhouse. For it seems there is, after all, a Shakespeare problem. Up to now, however, we who have not the Professor's advantages, we who are "laymen basing our arguments on facts and points of view long ago discredited by all competent historians of Elizabethan literature," we who "among a horde of attorneys at law, mathematicians and retired army officers with their camp followers drawn from the ranks of the intellectually unemployed" have not understood it.

The fact is that the traditional biography of William Shakspere of Stratford—all that we ever thought we knew about him—is wrong; it simply is not true; it consists of a number of "unwarranted assumptions" and really (as Professor Campbell is kind enough to admit) it is not unnatural that we who have accepted it find it hard to believe that this "bumpkin" (the Professor's word and not mine) should be England's pre-eminent literary genius.

There has, however, been excuse for us; we have been led astray by "incompetent historians," the Professor's own orthodox forbears,—that by the way—but he will lead us back to the Stratford shrine in the full light of "recent developments in Shakespeare scholarship" and we shall discover William Shakespeare to be "none other than himself."

Whether we do so or not, we shall quickly discover that Professor Campbell's controversial methods are, to say the least, peculiar.

The Shakespeare problem may be stated in these terms. Knowing all that we do of Shakspere of Stratford, taking into consideration the facts of his parentage, environment and early history, as well as those painfully suggestive of his later life and death, can we believe he was the author of, say, *Venus and Adonis*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Hamlet* and the *Sonnets*?

Professor Campbell begs this question without a blush. Firstly he assumes what he has to prove, viz., that the plays and poems *were* written by Shakspere of Stratford; with this all the facts must be made to square and, if they do not, so much the worse for the facts. Next he proceeds to construct an ideal figure, rejecting the testimony of the old note collectors, memoir writers and biographers where it does not suit this and then he puts into the mouths of opponents arguments which they never uttered and proceeds to reply to them to his own intense satisfaction and with entire success.

Now, with regard to the traditions which have come down to us of the life of William Shakspere, they vary, of course, in historical value and degree of credibility; but there is no reason to think that they do not express the opinions of those who knew the supposed dramatist in his lifetime and shortly after his death. They are, as has been said, evidence of reputation; they tell us—and there is nothing else to tell us—what manner of man Shakspere was according to contemporary belief, and they must not all be dismissed as "unwarranted assumptions" because they are difficult to reconcile with the Shakespeare the plays reveal. Yet this is just how Professor Campbell deals with them. He sets all sound principles of criticism at defiance by the way in which he plays fast and loose with the traditions. When it suits his theories, he accepts them as gospel; when inconvenient, he rejects them at his own sweet will and, although he dignifies this process by describing it as "merely changing the relative importance given to various traditions," he accepts or rejects them accordingly as they square or not with his pre-conceived idea of Shakspere of Stratford as Shakespeare the poet

and dramatist and upon no other principle that I can discover whatever.

Nothing, of course, could be more unscientific. Traditions should have been compared with the object of ascertaining whether and, if so, how far they support one another and are consistent with known facts: the gist of a statement should have been taken without undue stress being laid upon detail, instead of being dismissed as a gratuitous and foolish invention. It is not to be assumed that the witnesses who offer unpleasant or inconvenient evidence that Shakspere was apprenticed to a butcher or was one of the Bidford topers or a poacher or a horseboy are necessarily lying. It is only since last century that Shakspere's biography has been invested with all the colours of romance.

I give one example here of Professor Campbell's method —there are many others—the story that Shakspere went to the Stratford Grammar School: the Professor accepts that. Shakspere's earliest biographer, however, tells us that he was removed from a free school—he does not say where it was—at an early age because his father had need of his services. But that is inconvenient, so the Professor rejects it, although it is far more reliable, for there is no record—it is pure assumption—that Shakspere ever went to the Stratford Grammar School at all.

Why are we to accept traditional belief in Shakspere as playwright and to reject tradition when it tells us of a poaching butcher's apprentice of scanty education who made a speech when he killed calves?

Again let us look at the Professor's picture of the Stratford-on-Avon of 1584. "It was," he writes, "no collection of illiterate boors and yokels. It was an important centre of trade, the business metropolis of a large and fertile area and so of much greater relative importance than it is to-day." This is the Stratford of fancy. Now let us look at the Stratford of fact and consider the authorities which compel us to believe it so.

"It was," writes Halliwell Phillips, "a village of about 1,800 inhabitants. Sanitation was unknown. The streets

were foul with offal, heaps of muck and stable refuse, the accumulation of which neither the village ordnances nor fines levied upon the inhabitants could prevent. Two hundred years after the birth of William Shakspere, Stratford was described by David Garrick as "inhabited by bumpkins and boors" and as "the most dirty, unseemly, ill-paved wretched looking town in all Britain." We know, as a matter of fact, that on one occasion John Shakspere himself was assessed in the sum of twelve pence for having amassed what was no doubt a conspicuous heap of manure. Neither does it appear that the villagers were such as to find their environment uncongenial, although it is not to be inferred that they were inferior to the rest of the population and yeomanry of England in the sixteenth century. Henry Smith in 1605 was notified to "pluck down his pigges cote which was built near the chapel walk and the house or office there." John Sadler was fined for feeding his hogs in Chapel Lane; and in 1613 John Rogers, the vicar, erected a pig sty opposite the back Court of Shakspere's own house. For a century and a half after his death Chapel Ditch, which lay next to Shakspere's garden, was a receptacle for all manner of filth that anybody chose to put there. In 1635 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners suspended the Vicar of Stratford for "grossly particularising" in his sermons and for suffering poultry to roost and his hogs to lodge in the chancel. As late as 1734 the Stratford Court Leet "presented" Joseph Strawbridge in Henley Street, where descendents of the supposed poet's family were still living, for not carrying in his muck before his door.

These attested facts are surely preferable to the fancies of Professor Campbell who, of course, must see mediaeval Stratford as "meet nurse for a poetic child."

Again, why should Professor Campbell assume that its Grammar School was one of the best in England? For all he knows it may have been one of the worst, but, because he must provide William Shakspere with the knowledge that the Shakespeare plays reveal, he must postulate the "excellent Grammar School" at which

Shakspere "undoubtedly learned to read Latin easily and began the study of Greek: we may be sure," he writes, "that if Shakspere stayed in school until he was 15 or 16 he would have read Demosthenes and other classics." Why may we be sure? Only because the author of the Shakespeare plays had read them. It is in the highest degree improbable that Shakspere was long enough at school to have profited by any instruction except in the lowest classes. There is nothing whatever to make us believe that he was an industrious or talented boy, nor that he was "a lad of Shakespeare's keenness": no word of tribute either from headmaster to the budding genius nor from the genius in later years to the headmaster is extant. On the contrary, his traditional character leads us to the very opposite conclusion; yet the Professor piles one hypothesis upon another as if by doing so he could somehow create fact and as if a lattice work of assumption were a substitute for a chain of evidence. But if Shakspere did attend the Stratford Grammar School he would have learned to read and to write and the elements of Latin. Unless he reached the higher forms and was a particularly promising or favoured pupil, he would not have learned Greek. It is not likely that English or modern languages were taught: the first English Grammar was not published until 1586.

Again, in spite of every tradition and probability, Professor Campbell infers that John Shakspere could write his own name. It is undisputed that he used a mark when executing deeds and the Professor tells us he did so because a cross served as a signature and was a religious symbol. And that in an age when to be able to write one's name was something to be proud of, at any rate in the class to which the Shakspere family belonged!

"There is no reasonable pretence," according to Halliwell Phillips, "for assuming that in the time of John Shakspere, whatever might have been the case at earlier periods, it was the practice for marks to be used by those who were capable of signing their names. No instance of the kind has been discovered among the numerous records

of his era that are preserved at Stratford-on-Avon, while rare examples in other districts, if such are to be found, are insufficient to countenance a theory that he was able to write. All the evidence points in the opposite direction and it is to be observed that, in common with many other of his contemporaries, John Shakspere did not adhere to the same sign, at one time contenting himself with a rudely shaped cross and at another delineating a fairly good representation of a pair of dividers."

That surely disposes of the Professor's sign of the cross.

"But," he proceeds, "John Taylor and John Shakspere made a true and lawful account for their time being chamberlains," and he says this statement means just what it says. Of course it does, but the Professor should know that the way in which accounts were kept at the time was by tallies. These were shafts of wood used as receipts for money, goods or livestock. The keeping of accounts in this way involved no writing whatever.

"Neither of Shakspere's parents appear to have been able to write at all: they simply made their marks in execution of deeds: of Shakspere's two surviving children, the eldest, Susanna Hall, wrote a painfully formed signature which was probably the most she was capable of doing with the pen; the second, Judith Quiney, we conclude, could not write at all, for she signed with a mark." (Sir Edward Maude Thompson, *Shakespeare's England*, Vol. I, page 294.) Thus is Halliwell Phillips, an early biographer, corroborated by a modern authority whom I should certainly not care to describe as "ignorant of recent developments in Shakespeare scholarship"!

The portrait of William's father as one of the leaders in the business and political life of the community—"his skill as a processor of leather," we are told, "brought him a small fortune"—is an exceedingly flattering one—all light and no shadow. Professor Campbell omits to mention that, while William was still a youth, his father's fortunes declined; he who had been plaintiff and creditor again and again became a harassed debtor: his creditors gave him no peace and, when in 1586 one of them obtained

a writ of distraint, he found no goods upon which to levy it. He absented himself from church and from meetings of the Town Council and was deprived of his alderman's gown: he mortgaged his wife's estate and when he died in 1601 of all the property which had passed through his hands, only the Henley Street houses were left.

Once more, it is highly convenient for Professor Campbell to assume that John Shakspere never was in financial difficulties because it is then unnecessary to suppose that he removed his son from school, whence it follows that William might have continued to prosecute his studies for several more years and so have improved his classical education. Sir Sidney Lee has exposed the absurdity of this theory.

It is indeed difficult to discover what Shakspere did between 1588 when he is supposed to have left Stratford—twins had been born to him there in 1584 and twins must have a father—and 1593 when we first hear of him as an actor in London. The gap is generally filled by orthodox biographers exactly as they please and Professor Campbell is no exception. In order to assist his own theories he spins these brain cobwebs. First he tells us that the deer stealing story is the least credible of all, but Sir E. K. Chambers says that he does not think, so far as the essential feature is concerned, we are called upon to reject it. The account of it given by Rowe, Shakspere's earliest biographer, has independent confirmation in the notes of Richard Davis, who became Rector of Sapperton, Gloucestershire, in 1695. Professor Campbell is wrong in stating the latter is the only authority: there is a fourfold testimony through Davies, Rowe, Jones and Barnes to a tradition of the deer stealing as alive at Stratford about the end of the seventeenth century (*William Shakespeare*, Vol. I, p. 20). But perhaps Sir E. K. Chambers is also an "incompetent historian, unaware of recent developments in Shakespeare scholarship," although his masterly work is dated 1930.

Let us listen, then, to Sir Walter Raleigh (*Shakespeare*; English Men of Letters Series, p. 43). "All the evidence

that remains to us is unanimous in its favour and there is no solid argument against it. Some antiquaries have felt free to reject it and to substitute an account of how things *must* have happened. If we follow them here we must reject the whole body of tradition; and it is worth remarking that the Shakespeare traditions which have come down to us are in the main good traditions. They are not tainted in origin and were not collected or published by anyone who had a case to prove." They deserved better of Professor Campbell, who *does* substitute for them an account of how things must have happened and *has*, of course, a case to prove.

Secondly, the stories that Shakspere first earned a living in London by holding horses for gentry who came to the theatre and was subsequently taken into the employment of the players as a servitor are rejected in favour of a fancy that he took *Titus Andronicus* and *The Comedy of Errors* up to London with him in the hope of selling them. The actors liked them and bought and produced both works, attaching Shakspere to their company as an assistant to their book-keeper, who combined the duties of librarian, prompter and producer. These airy fables are, of course, unsupported by any evidence whatever. This is surely much more than "changing the relative importance" given to various traditions—it is myth-making, pure and simple.

And why is Professor Campbell silent about Dr. Hotson's discovery that in 1596 William Wayte swore that William Shakspere, Francis Langley and two women threatened him with danger to life and limb and sought a guarantee against a breach of the peace? Shakspere was then lodging near the Bear Garden in Southwark, defaulting in payment of subsidies there. Does Professor Campbell think this "gives a kind of innate probability" to the butcher, poacher, player *author* rather than to the serious minded schoolmaster, book-keeper, playwright, interested in the new developments in the vigorous young drama of 1586? And so once more "changes the relative importance," now be it noted, of an ascertained *fact* and not

tradition: in less polite language, ignores it entirely, substituting pure fiction which will indeed undoubtedly "produce a revolution in the minds of most laymen" but perhaps not of the kind Professor Campbell anticipates.

We know that in 1593 Shakspere was a member of a company of players and presumably it was before this that he *might* have spent his spare time in study, and he *might* have had the opportunity of making a friend of Lord Southampton and coming into contact with the life of Court and culture in London.

Unfortunately for Professor Campbell, we know, too, that professional actors at the time were regarded by the law as rogues and vagabonds and they were permitted to play only by joining one of the companies patronised by great noblemen with whom, however, it is extremely unlikely they associated on familiar terms. Social distinctions were far too great to allow this and for the Stratford Shakspere to have become an actor must have entailed hard work of various kinds inside and outside the theatre and on tour in the country. There were no public libraries; books were scarce and extremely expensive. How, in 1589, could this Shakspere, 25 years of age, have written *Love's Labour's Lost*—a comedy so classical in style and language, so laboriously erudite, so peculiarly affected and topical that even to-day a considerable degree of understanding is necessary to appreciate the subtlety of its satire and its penetrating wit? It could have appealed only to a very small audience of scholars. Yet this comedy was quickly followed by four or five others, the masterpieces *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* both having been written before 1592. Here is Professor Campbell's dilemma —on the one hand the personality of the Stratford player "all but destitute" when he arrived in London according to Halliwell Phillips, of "polite accomplishments," and on the other hand the perfect polish and urbanity of the earliest productions of *Shakespeare*. We have seen how he attempts to escape—by invention, just as his predecessors invented. To account for the early plays and

poems, Shakspere of Stratford has been made lawyer, schoolmaster, gardener, printer, soldier and a great many other things besides: the only difference between Professor Campbell and his predecessors is that the former enjoys a greater facility for reaching his desired conclusion, which is that Shakspere had been a schoolmaster.

The suggestion that he was ever employed as a schoolmaster is Aubrey's, who wrote more than sixty years after Shakspere's death. Aubrey quotes Beeston, a seventeenth century actor, as his authority, and Professor Campbell catches at this as drowning men clutch at a straw. Professor Campbell does not tell us that Aubrey is a somewhat unreliable witness. He was a "roving, maggoty-pated man," according to Anthony Wood, and his little biographies have been described as disfigured by palpable or ascertained blunders. But let us have Aubrey all in all or not at all. Why did not Professor Campbell quote his authority in full? "Mr. William Shakespear was borne at Stratford upon Avon, in the County of Warwick; his father was a butcher and I have been told heretofore by some of the neighbours, that when he was a boy he exercised his father's Trade, but when he killed a Calfe, he would do it in a high style and make a speech. . . . This Wm. being inclined naturally to poetry and acting came to London I guesse about 18 and was an actor at one of the Play-houses and did act exceedingly well . . . Though as Ben: Johnson sayes of him, that he had but little Latine and lesse Greek, He understood Latine pretty well: for he had been in his younger yeares a schoolmaster in the countrey." (In margin, 'from Mr. —— Beeston.') Aubrey collected his *Brief Lives* as material for the *Athenae Oxonienses* of Anthony Wood, who, however, found no room in his book for Shakespeare. Aubrey himself made no use of his note about Beeston and this is the only "authority." Professor Campbell calls it "the most authentic tradition about Shakspere's life before going to London"; coming from a Restoration actor reporting his father, whom Aubrey could never have seen: a man who never thought to mention it for decades after

Shakspere's death until old age and mental decay had refreshed and vivified memories! This is the authority for the following from Professor Campbell "It is not too much to assume that a lad of Shakespeare's keenness was apt in his studies and found them more congenial than those of the village crafts. At any rate he decided not to enter his father's business and not to apprentice himself to another trade. Instead he took a position as a schoolmaster in a neighbouring village." And the mountain in labour brings forth this ridiculous mouse.

We know that Shakspere married at 18, had his first child at 19, was father of twins at 21, and probably came to London at the age of 23. "And to close the whole," as Richard Farmer writes in his celebrated essay, "it is not possible, according to Aubrey himself, that Shakspere could have been for some years a schoolmaster in the country. He was not surely very young when he was employed to kill calves and he commenced player about 18." When then did this marvellous boy find time before 18 to be, in his younger years, a country schoolmaster? It is true that the old writers who are our authorities for the facts of Shakspere's early life tell us he was apprenticed to his father's trade, but what of that? It is much better for Professor Campbell's purpose to make him a schoolmaster. "Well informed scholars are now able to write quite a different account of Shakspere's career," with the result that we have now a very full and very delightful biography of Shakspere which leaves nothing to be desired except veracity.

But the picture of William Shakspere as a country pedagogue is only less ridiculous than that of him writing *The Comedy of Errors* in imitation of Plautus and *Titus Andronicus* in imitation of Seneca during his leisure hours. It was Professor Quincy Adams, another gifted biographer of Shakspere who propounded the happy theory that the *Comedy of Errors* was written at Stratford before Shakspere went to London. Now the *Comedy of Errors*, according to the late Mr. J. M. Robertson, is in large part in pure Marlowese comedy-

verse; so that in terms of Messrs. Adams' and Campbell's pleasing hypothesis the young Shakspere living in Stratford or a neighbouring village wrote Marlowese before Marlow did. Our respectful admiration is certainly due to the courage of these twin brethren in their adventurous journey to Bedlam. That it is commonly accepted that *Titus Andronicus* is not a Shakespearean work at all apparently does not trouble Professor Campbell, but one would have imagined that *The Comedy of Errors* would have presented a little difficulty to him, seeing that this farce was apparently translated from the original Latin of Plautus (there was no English translation extant) and completed before the end of 1594 when it was performed at Gray's Inn. Shakspere was then thirty years of age, he had been six or seven years in London and we are told that his genius had taught him to write in the purest English, undefiled by Warwickshire patois of any kind, the erudite poems, *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*, *Love's Labour's Lost* and possibly *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. How was he able to do it?

Well, even the new biography of Shakspere as constructed by himself, assisted by other well-informed scholars, does not quite satisfy Professor Campbell; neither I think will it satisfy anyone else. It does not explain for him'' the transcendent qualities of Shakespeare's poetic skill and imagination.'' Why, then, may it not be made to measure? Instead of imagining that Shakspere took a position as a schoolmaster in a neighbouring village, why not send him to a University and to the Inns of Court? His contemporary poets and playwrights were university men, but the greatest of them all was bred in a free school, according to his first biographer—according to Professor Campbell at Stratford's excellent Grammar School. Why not send him to France to learn the secrets of the French court, to Italy in order to learn its language and topography; then bring him back to London to meet the noblemen of Elizabeth's court, to learn an exquisite English with a vocabulary as large again as Milton's and to write plays in which, as Emerson says, ''the speakers do not strut and

bawl; the dialogue is easily great and Shakespeare earns, in addition to so many other titles, that of being the best bred man in England and in Christendom''? The Professor is surely capable of even greater imaginative effort: he must account for his country schoolmaster's essentially aristocratic temper and sympathy: his profound interest in the public events of his time: his philosophic mind, so curiously associated with the tastes and habits of a man of the world.

Whence came the aesthetic sensibility and profound reflection, the inspired insight into spiritual and dramatic truth, characteristic of even the earliest plays and the Sonnets?

''Literary genius,'' replies the Professor, ''the ways of which remain inscrutable.'' They certainly remain inscrutable to Professor Campbell. Did not, he asks, Ben Johnson begin life as a bricklayer? Was not Keats born in rooms above a livery stable?

Now Shakespeare, as Dr. Jonson wrote, however favoured by nature, could impart only what he had learned. Genius must provide the combinations, but only reading, observation and experience can supply the knowledge. Genius cannot translate a language it does not know, nor confer familiarity with the geography of untravelled canal systems it has never seen, nor with the technicalities of professions it has never practised. God does not whisper these things in its ear. Genius may give the power of acquiring knowledge, but it is not knowledge. It is a gift of nature, but nature alone never yet gave knowledge, culture or such a vocabulary, the music of which is akin to the speech of gods. Many a mute inglorious Milton rests in many a country churchyard. And why? Because

> Knowledge to their eyes her ample page
> Rich with the spoils of time did ne'er unroll.

The genius was there, but the knowledge was never acquired.

Neither can genius revise its work after the death of its mortal vehicle, nor in a word can it work miracles unless, Circe-like, it can transform swine or raise, like

Aladdin, a palace from a roc's egg. Neither to the player Shakspere, does Professor Campbell contend was granted the Divine Inspiration of the Holy Ghost that he should speak with tongues and prophesy! The Professor, like so many other orthodox apologists, uses the word "Genius" as a magic wand or cabalistic symbol to save the trouble of thinking further. It is not sufficient to write that Shakspere was a genius: it is necessary to show what the conditions were which enabled his genius to develop itself, led him to find the form of expression which best suited its character and secured for what it produced both contemporary popularity and eternal fame. That is why it is important for us to realise in what environment Shakspere grew to manhood. The facts that he was born of illiterate parents in a squalid country town: the stories of his youth and formative years: the circumstances of his marriage, if he did marry (the witnesses to the Bond against impediments were both farmers or farm labourers): the traditions of his life in London and of his last years in Stratford: his typical tradesman's Will and the fact that he allowed his daughter to grow up in illiteracy are all matters to which due importance should be given when we consider the Stratfordian's claim to authorship. We know he made no claim whatever to this himself.

It is not perhaps surprising that Professor Campbell and other modern scholars ignore Shakspere's later life. Surely the facts that Shakspere, if he were Shakespeare, could, after a life in London as a successful dramatist, the favourite of King and Court and the associate of the highest culture in the land, return to the society of boors and bumpkins to brew, to buy land, to indulge in petty litigation and to lend money are significant. He retires neither to read nor to write: he who "filled up all numbers" is from the age of 45 until he dies at 52 silent forever. Wit, combats and tippling, these are the last occupations of the greatest mind and sweetest singer since there was music in the world. There is no "new account" of Shakspere's later life: even "well informed scholars" cannot reject the facts: they are too much even for "recent developments in Shakespeare scholarship": they make it incredible that

this Shakspere was the Shakespeare of the plays and poems. It is not that we know too little of Shakspere. We know so much too much to believe him Shakespeare. Hallam could not. "We as little feel the power of identifying the young man who came up from Stratford with the author of *Macbeth* and *Lear* as we can give a distinct historic personality to Homer. Emerson could not. "Other men," he wrote, "have led lives in some sort of keeping with their thought, but this man in wide contrast.' and Henry James confessed his conviction "that the divine William is the biggest and most successful fraud practised on a patient world."

Although its history has been ransacked for a case analogous to that of Shakespeare, assuming the truth of the Stratford hypothesis, none has ever been found in the world. Supposed parallel cases prove to be no parallel. Professor Campbell again trots out the supposed analogies of Keats and Jonson. "Keats," he writes, "was born above a livery stable," and so he may have been. His parents, however, were quite comfortably off and he belonged to the upper rank of the middle class. They were people of no every day character; Keats' father was a man of remarkably fine commonsense and his wife was known as a woman of uncommon talent. At the age of eight their son was put to a school of excellent reputation kept by John Clarke at Enfield, where he secured the friendship of the headmaster's son, Charles Cowden Clarke, not unknown as a Shakespearian critic; who was usher in the school, and by whom according to Sir Herbert Warren, Keats was introduced to poets old and new—to Spencer and Chaucer, to Homer in English and to Virgil and Horace, and perhaps Ovid, in Latin. In his early years he is said to have made a translation of the whole of the *Aeneid*. His intimate companions were Leigh Hunt, Reynolds, Hazlitt, Haydon (the artist), and Basil Montague. There may be a comparison, but there is certainly no analogy between Keats and Shakespeare.

With regard to Jonson, of whom we know more than of any great writer of the age, his case is even less analogous to that of the Stratford Shakspere. He was educated at

the best school that existed in England and was moreover the special protége of the great and learned Camden. "During the years he spent at Westminster," wrote John Addington Symonds, "we must imagine him absorbing all the new learning of the Greeks and Romans which England had derived from Italian humanism, drinking in knowledge at every sense, and, after books were cast aside, indulging his leisure in studying the humours of the town which lay around him." Jonson's stepfather did his duty well by the poet that was to be, for he put Benjamin to school, providing for the first stage of a training which was destined to produce one of the wisest scholars and most learned poets whom English annals can boast. Everything is plain in Jonson's case. He had just the kind of training which was calculated to give his genius the power to produce those fruits which it did produce. No sceptic, as far as I know, has ever contended that genius has been solely in the custody of men of noble birth of wealth, or of wide learning. I cannot see that any useful purpose is served by Professor Campbell's method of argument which consists in ignoring the real contentions of his opponents in order to destroy foolish opinions attributed to, but never in fact advanced by, them. Professor Campbell must try again.

It is in view of all the circumstances of his environment (even as Professor Campbell imagines these) and the opportunities open to him that Shakspere of Stratford could not have produced the works of Shakespeare. Shakespeare's new biographers, whose thoughts run so gracefully free from the trammels of precision, who now realise the peril of continuing to embroider the poor boy theme and of still seeing Shakespeare as a Warwickshire peasant; whose object is, of course, the pious and excellent one of glorifying the Stratford actor and upholding the orthodox faith, add "genius" and all the rest follows. The new Shakespeare is once more an unlearned one who listened to sermons and who, when he needed "a few facts," relied upon his fellow players to assist him in writing *Hamlet*. Professor Cambell thinks that Shakespeare's learning can be shown to be no more than the

knowledge in the possession of all intelligent persons of his day. It is very difficult to believe the Professor writes seriously. His study of *Troilus and Cressida* demonstrates that his knowledge of Elizabethan literature is profound. Does he know nothing of Elizabethan life and manners?

According to Buckle's *History of Civilisation in England*, the public mind was in Shakespeare's time benighted and the darkness was shared not merely by men of an average education, but by men of considerable ability, men in every respect among the foremost of their age, for in those times, as in all others, everything was as of a piece. Not only in historical literature, but in all kinds of literature on every subject—in science, in religion, in legislation—the presiding principle was a blind and unhesitating credulity. The more the history of Europe anterior to the seventeenth century is studied, the more completely will this fact be verified. Now and then a great man arose who had his doubts respecting the universal belief, who whispered a suspicion as to the existence of giants thirty feet high, of dragons with wings and of armies flying through the air, who thought that astrology might be a cheat and necromancy a bubble, and who even went so far as to raise a question respecting the propriety of drowning every witch and burning every heretic. A few such men there undoubtedly were, but they were despised as mere theorists, idle visionaries, who, unacquainted with the practice of life, arrogantly opposed their own reason to the wisdom of their ancestors. In the time of Shakspere the so-called civilisation of Europe was, for the most part, a whirlpool of brute force, and Englishmen were little, if anything, behind the rest of the world in the folly and ferocity of their minds. According to Burton, the English towns were mean, base built, inglorious, poor, ruinous, thin of inhabitants and vile and ugly to behold. Even in Elizabethan London—the only one among them that bore the face of a city—the poor lay in the streets upon straw or else in the mire and dirt and were permitted to die in the streets like dogs, without any compassion shown to them at all. The picture drawn by

Burton, Stubbs and many others is not flattering to that "knowledge in the possession of intelligent persons," which, according to Professor Campbell, is similar to that of Shakspere, whose early environment, we are told, far from being utterly mean and uncouth, was one which might have easily nourished a man of literary genius.

We sceptics who are neither intelligent historians nor well-informed scholars; handicapped, as the Professor says we are, by lack of learning and unaware of recent developments in Shakespearian scholarship, find it difficult to believe that the real Shakespeare, the supreme Poet and Dramatist, was as poorly equipped by education and culture as Professor Campbell thinks him. We agree that he is right with regard to Shakspere of Stratford, but somehow or another we think of the author of *Hamlet* and *Lear* as a man several centuries in advance of his age, endowed with a magnificent intellect and a learning quite inconsistent with Professor Campbell's "average intelligence" and the "never no scholar" of the "unlearned Shakespeare" school of modern critics and comparable even with "the best classical students in an American college of to-day"! We are quite ready to admit that Abraham Sturley, in the two letters in which he refers to his countryman Mr. Shakspere, "or Mr. Wm. Shak," interlards his epistles with scraps of Latin. He therefore had, it is true, some Latin and Mr. Wm. Shakspere no doubt had as much. The real Shakespeare, we think, had very much more and *pace* Professor Campbell we do not plead guilty to a false and unintelligent assertion when we say so.

From one absurdity Professor Campbell passes to another. He writes that Shakespeare need not have been a lawyer to display a smattering of legal lore. Now a curious change has lately manifested itself in orthodox criticism with regard to Shakespeare's law, and one must suppose that this, too, is the result of recent developments in Shakespeare scholarship. Among "the immature critics handicapped by their lack of training," as the Professor described them in terms more forcible than polite, who have contended with Lord Campbell (in 1859

Lord Chancellor, having previously been Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench) that Shakespeare had "a deep technical knowledge of the law" and an easy familiarity with "some of the most abstruse proceedings in English jurisprudence," were the well-known Shakespearian critics, Richard Grant White, who wrote that "No dramatist of the time, not even Beaumont, who was a younger son of a judge of the Common Pleas, and who, after studying in the Inns of Court, abandoned law for the drama, used legal phrases with Shakespeare's readiness and exactness": Lord Penzance, Judge Webb and Judge Holmes, of the Supreme Court of the United States, among lawyers, and, among lay critics and commentators, George Steevens, Malone, Charles and Mary Cowden Clark, who wrote of "the marvellous intimacy which he (Shakespeare) displays with legal terms, his frequent adoption of them in illustration, and his curious technical knowledge of their form and force," and Professor Churton Collins, who noticed Shakespeare's "minute and undeviating accuracy in a subject where no layman who has indulged in such copious and ostentatious display of legal technicalities has ever yet succeeded in keeping himself from tripping."

This formidable body of opinion is rejected by Professor Campbell, and we are told that it was enough for Shakespeare to have observed and admired the literary manner of some of his fellows. The lavish use of legal terminology was a popular poetic convention and two of Shakespeare's predecessors in the sonnet vogue were addicted to this particular form of imaginative decoration.

The Professor's references to Barnes and Samuel Daniel are most unfortunate for his case, because with regard to Barnes, if the reader will turn to the one hundred and four Sonnets and twenty-six Madrigals of *Parthenophil* and *Parthenophe*, he will only find legal allusions in nine of the Sonnets and one Madrigal. How different to the Shakespeare *Sonnet* XLVI, which is so intensely legal in its language and imagery that, without a considerable knowledge of English forensic procedure, it cannot be fully understood! It is not a question of the mere use of legal phrases or maxims such as are indeed common among

Sonneteers of the time, but of the exhibition by Shakespeare of such a sound and accurate legal knowledge, such a familiarty with legal life and customs, as could not possibly have been acquired or picked up by the Stratford player. And had these Sonneteers themselves legal training and, if not, do we find them habitually using legal expressions as accurately and appropriately as Shakespeare uses them or, in other words, are such writers comparable with him not only in the quantity but in the quality of their legal terms and allusions? "Legal phrases flow from Shakespeare's pen as part of his vocabulary and parcel of his thought," as Richard Grant White puts it, and it is not to the purpose at all to compile lists of legal terms and expressions from the pages of other Elizabethan writers. One wonders whether Professor Campbell would describe critics as recent as George W. Keeton, M.A., LL.M. (1930), and the late Mr. E. E. Fripp (1938), as handicapped by their lack of training and as neither well-informed nor modern scholars.

The Shakespeare of the Plays was, it appears, a home-keeping youth with homely wits, travelling only in imagination. Those who have written, as the great Danish critic, George Brandes, wrote, of Shakespeare's correct use of Italian names, his remarkable characterisation of Italian cities and districts in a single phrase, of the strict accuracy of the betrothal scene in the *Taming of the Shrew*, peculiarly Italian, and the minutest details of domestic life, make "false and unintelligent assertions." Certainly modern scholarship has travelled far—in the direction of delusion.

What Shakspere did not "pick up" in the course of conversation in the Mermaid tavern and other inns, it seems he imagined and imaginative literature is not a faintly disguised history of the author's own life. Nobody is so idiotic as to believe it is, but, as Sir Walter Raleigh wrote, "Shakespeare was a man and a writer: when he wrote it was himself that he related to paper—his own mind that he revealed. No dramatist can create living characters save by bequeathing himself to the children of his heart, scattering among them his own qualities; it may be to one

his wit; to another his philosophic doubt; to another his love of action; to another the simplicity and constancy that he finds deep in his own nature. There is no thrill of feeling communicated from the printed page, but has first been alive in the mind of the author: there was nothing alive in his mind that was not intensely and sincerely felt. Plays like those of Shakespeare call forth the man's whole energies and take toll of the last farthing of his wealth of sympathy and experience. "... How dare we complain that he has hidden himself from our knowledge?" It is we who are to blame if we try to measure him by ourselves. Of course, imaginative literature is not a faintly disguised history of the author's own life, but it is a clue to it. Every man's work, whether it be literature or music or pictures or architecture or anything else, is always a portrait of himself, and the more he tries to conceal himself the more clearly will his character appear in spite of him.

"Do men gather grapes off thorns or figs off thistles?" This might be made the test of the argument that there is no relation between the work of Shakespeare and the man to whom it is attributed. We are presented with the fruit and afterwards from the tree whence it comes. We are told that the Shakespearian plays are purely objective; that nowhere in them does the author reveal himself. In this respect, then, Shakespeare is the sole exception to the universal law that there is a relation between the life of the artist and that which his genius creates. No one denies that the work of Byron and of Hugo and of Milton would have been different if they themselves had been different men. But not Shakespeare. We might just as well be asked to believe that he, and he alone, could live without food, drink and sleep.

The works of Shakespeare were not written by Shakspere of Stratford, nor yet by "another gentleman of the same name." The real Shakespeare or Shake-speare was a man who bore an entirely different name—one who lived and moved and had his being in a totally different sphere of life from that in which Shakspere of Stratford lived and moved. Who then *was* Shakespeare himself if he was not Shakspere of Stratford? That is another story.

BACON-SHAKESPEARE ANATOMY.

(PART VI)

By W. S. Melsome.

WE now come to King Henry's reply to Wolsey's remarkable speech:—

"Things done well
And with a care, exempt themselves from fear."
(*H8*, *I*, 2, 88.)

"*The judge as long as his judgment was contained within the compass of the law was excused; the subject knew by what law he was to govern himself and his actions; nothing was left to the judge's discretion; and when it was required long since by a bill in parliament to have somewhat left to the judge to allow or dislike in a particular case which should be made arbitrary by the said bill, it was rejected, and upon this reason, that men were better be subject to a known inconvenience than to an unknown discretion.*"
(*Life*, *III*, pp. 331-2.)

When the duke said to Angelo,

"Your scope is as mine own,
So to enforce or qualify the laws
As to your soul seems good"
(*Meas.*, *I*, 1, 65),

he subjected the citizens of Vienna to an unknown discretion, and the result proved the wisdom of the members of the English parliament, and drew forth from Isabel the following words:—

"O perilous mouths,
That bear in them one and the self-same tongue,
Either of condemnation or approof;
Bidding the law make court'sy to their will;
Hooking both right and wrong to the appetite."
(*Meas.*, *II*, 4, 172.)

Henry's speech continued:—

"Things done without example, in their issue
Are to be fear'd. Have you a precedent
Of this commission? I believe not any."

(*H8, I, 2, 90.*)

Then remember this, that "*unjust sentences, such as we spoke of, which are afterwards drawn into precedents (a quibus exempla petuntur) infect and defile the very fountain of justice.*" (*De Aug., VIII, II, parabola XXV*); and if you infect and defile the fountain of justice by passing an unjust sentence in any grave and weighty cause, you also infect and defile the streams that flow from that fountain; because

"'Twill be recorded for a precedent,
And many an error by the same example
Will rush into the state."

(*Merchant, IV,* 1-220.)

We now see the significance of Bacon's "*a quibus exempla petuntur*" in the passage just quoted; all the more significant when we remember that the above three lines from Portia are in reply to Bassanio who has asked her to pass an unjust sentence in a grave and weighty cause.

In his explanation of this, his 25th selected parable, Bacon goes on to say, "*For when once the court goes on the side of injustice the law becomes a public robber and one man simply a wolf to another.*" (*De Aug., VIII, II, parabola XXV*), and again "Shakespeare" gives the reason which is this:—

"Thieves for their robbery have authority
When judges steal themselves."

(*Meas., II, 2,* 176.)

And there can be no doubt that when Angelo used these words he was afflicted with what Bacon calls "*the troubled fountain of a corrupt heart.*" (*Life, VII,* p. 226.) He, the supreme equity judge: the man of "absolute power and place here in Vienna," and therefore the fountain of justice, knew well enough that in passing an unjust and scandalous sentence upon Claudio, he was defiling and

corrupting the fountain. I say "knew well enough" because when he said,

> "O, let her brother live:
> Thieves for their robbery have authority
> When judges steal themselves,"

he was reasoning with and upbraiding himself.

> "*To leave the letter of the law makes the judge a legislator.*" (Exempla Antithetorum.)

Wolsey "was a man of an unbounded stomach . . . his own opinion was his law." (*H8, IV*, 2, 33.)

He left the letter of the law and made himself a legislator, just as Angelo did in 'Measure for Measure.'

Observe again how "Shakespeare" follows Bacon in dealing with Jason of Thessalia:—

> "*Jason the Thessalian used to say, some things must be done unjustly, that many more may be done justly. But the answer is ready,—Present justice is in our power, but of future justice we have no security: let men pursue those things which are good and just at present, and leave futurity to Divine providence.*"
>
> (*De Aug., VII*, 11.)

When Bassanio put Jason's proposition before Portia, her answer was equally ready:—

Bassanio to Portia:

> "Wrest once the law to your authority;
> To do a great right do a little wrong."
>
> (*Merchant, IV*, 1, 215.)

Portia to Bassanio:

> "It must not be. There is no power in Venice
> Can alter a decree established;"

for when once the law has been fixed and established and exposed to public view "*no court of equity should have the right to decree contrary to a statute under any pretext of equity whatever, otherwise the judge would become a legislator, and have all things dependent upon his will.*"

(*De Aug., VIII, III*, 44.)

"Bidding the law make court'sy to (his) will
Hooking both right and wrong to the appetite."
(*Meas.*, *II*, 4, 175.)

So in Henry VIII:—

"We must not rend our subjects from our laws
And stick them in our will."
(*H8*, *I*, 2, 93);
Bidding the law make court'sy to (our) will.

"Have you a precedent of this commission? I believe not any."

Very well, then, as Portia says,

"'Twill be recorded for a precedent,
And many an error by the same example
Will rush into the state."

And from this we conclude that an unjust law is a disease in a state, like to infection, just as "envy is a disease in a state like to infection." (*Essay IX*.)

Let us now see how Henry quelled the "rebellion of the belly" caused by "hunger and lack of other means."

"The first remedy, or prevention, is to remove by all means possible, that material cause of sedition whereof we spake, which is want and poverty in the estate."
(*Essay XV*, 1625.)

Henry VIII:—

"To every county
Where this is question'd send our letters, with
Free pardon to each man that has denied
The force of this commission."
(*H8*, *I*, 2, 98.)

These letters were to be sent to the discontented counties of England where "bold mouths," "all in uproar" traduced and censured Wolsey on account of his exactions. Thus Henry ended the rebellion, not as Menenius Agrippa did, by a fable, but by cancelling Wolsey's commission, and so removing the cause as Bacon advises.

In the last issue of BACONIANA (October, 1940) we saw that Bacon and Shakespeare objected to a gangrenous or scarecrow law because it was a disease in a state like to

infection; the reason being that scarecrow laws *"bring a gangrene, neglect, and habit of disobedience upon other wholesome laws that are fit to be retained in practice and execution"*; and we have just seen that both agree that an unjust law is also a disease in a state like to infection, because it will be recorded for a precedent, and so cause the infection to spread; and again that they are in complete accord as to the answer that should be given in cases of what Bacon calls *"comparative duty . . . where the question is of a good deal of good to ensue of a small injustice, which Jason of Thessalia determined against the truth."* (*Adv., II*, 21, 11.)

In dealing with seditions, caused by griefs and discontents, I have purposely selected essays IX and XV, because they were not printed in England before 1625; and for a similar reason I have picked out 'King John,' 'Coriolanus' and 'King Henry VIII' which were not printed before November 1623. It is quite clear, therefore, that none of the reputed authors of these plays, not even Bacon himself, could have borrowed from the printed essays. It is equally clear that Bacon could not have seen the three printed plays before writing his MS. essay of seditions (1607-12), and yet in 30 lines of 'King John' there are six reminders of this particular essay, and five of them within the space of 20 lines of it. The sixth is also in the essay, but not within the 20 lines:—

1. *Discontent* which is the cause of
2. *Tempests in state*
3. *The pillars of government* that were at fault: *religion and justice*
4. *Fair weather* that men had need to pray for to calm the tempest
5. The reference to Isaiah XLV, 1, and
6. The reference to Tacitus (Hist. II, 39).

(This was recorded in the last issue of BACONIANA.)

Bacon was a "thief," and so was "Shakespeare"; but seldom do we find so much felony in the plays as we do in

seventy-seven lines of King Henry VIII (I, 2, 17 to 94) which contain twenty-six reminders of Bacon.

As Galba's actions made him traduced and censured by the Roman soldiers; so, Wolsey's actions made him "traduced by ignorant tongues" and "malicious censurers."

The "sick interpreters" also stolen from that passage in Tacitus which contains the word "interpretari" (*Hist., II*, 39 ; so, also, "Bold mouths," "language unmannerly" and "tongues spit their duties out."

"Griefs" and "grievances" explained in Essay XV. "We must not stint our necessary actions": the reason why in Essay IX. "The fate of place" in Essay IX, and Bacon's explanation of Ecclesiastes, X, 1.

"The rough brake that virtue must go through," also in Bacon's Ecclesiastes, X, 1.

"But benefit no further than vainly longing" (line 80), explained in "The Advancement of Learning" (II, 23, 47), regarding "*the offence of futility, as in Sisyphus and Tantalus.*"

"But you frame things . . . which are not wholesome," explained by Bacon in his subsidy speech (*Life, I*, p. 223), which we shall come to again in a moment.

"Things done well . . . exempt themselves from fear," and "things done without example . . . are to be feared," and "we must not rend our subjects from our laws," all explained by Bacon as in the text.

It seems to me that the felon must be Bacon himself, because he is the only man who need not await the publication of his own prose works before making use of them. Some have supposed that Bacon collaborated with a man who called himself "Shakespeare," allowing him to have access to his mind, or to his manuscripts, long before they were printed; but against this supposition we have but to turn to Works VI, p. 523, to note how jealous Bacon was lest his writings should be stolen and abused. (See preface to the first edition of his essays.)

If anyone should require further evidence of the close

agreement between Bacon and the author of that scene in 'King Henry VIII,' which has just been dealt with, let him turn to two speeches: one which Bacon delivered in parliament in 1593, and the other in 1604 (*Life, I*, p. 223, and *Life, III*, p. 181).

In the first there are two things to be noted,—

"*Danger and discontentment.*" Danger to Elizabeth from excessive taxation of "*the general commonalty.*" (*Life, I*, p. 223). As Bacon warns the members of parliament of discontentment caused by oppression of the poor people and the consequent danger to the queen; so, Norfolk warns Henry VIII that the poor people "are all in uproar and danger serves among them."

(*H8, I*, 2, 36.)

And as, in April 1604, Bacon was solicited by members of parliament to petition King James concerning the "*great grievance*" of the common people in which he says, "*It is affirmed unto me by divers gentlemen of good regard*"; (*Life, III*, p. 185); so, in 'King Henry VIII,' Katharine is solicited to petition the King concerning the "great grievance" of the common people, in which she says, "I am solicited, not by a few, and those of true condition" (*H8, I*, 2, 18),

". . . *that there is no pound profit which redoundeth to your Majesty in this course, but induceth and begetteth three pound damage upon your subjects, besides the discontentment.*"

(*Life, III*, p. 185.)

Katharine: "Your subjects are in great grievance"

(Line 19.)

Bacon: "*Concerning the great grievance arising by the manifold abuses of purveyors*"

Life, III, p. 182.)

"*But yet notwithstanding* (*most excellent King*) *to use that freedom which to subjects that pour out their griefs*" (*Ib.*, p. 183.)

Katharine: "The subjects' grief comes through commissions" (Line 56.)

Bacon: *"The commissions they bring down are against the law"* (*Life, III*, p. 185.)
"They take in kind what they ought not to take . . . instead of takers they become taxers." (*Ib.*, p. 184.)

Norfolk: ". . upon these taxations,
The clothiers all, not able to maintain
The many to them 'longing, have put off
The spinsters, carders, fullers, weavers, who,
Unfit for other life . ."
(*H8, I*, 2, 30.)

Henry: "Taxation!
Wherein and what taxation?"

Bacon: *"They tax your people ad redimendam vexationem imposing upon them and extorting from them divers sums of money"* (p. 184.)

Katharine: "Compel from each the sixth part of his substance, to be levied without delay"
(Line 57.)
"And the pretence for this
Is named your wars with France"
(Line 59.)

Bacon: *"War was made but a pretence to poll and pill the people"* (*Hist., Hen. VII.*)
"The commons hath he pilled with grievous taxes,
And quite lost their hearts"
(*R2, II*, 1, 246.)

Bacon: *"Again they use a strange and most unjust exaction"*
(*Life, III*, p. 184.)
"And daily new exactions are devised,
As blanks, benevolences, and I wot not what"
(*R2, II*, 1, 249.)

There can be no pretence of war; for
"Wars hath not wasted it, for warred he hath not
But basely yielded upon compromise"
(*Ib., II*, 1, 252.)

Katharine: "These exactions
Whereof my sovereign would have note, they are
Most pestilent to the hearing"
(Line 47.)

Henry: "Still exactions!
The nature of it? in what kind, let's know
Is this exaction?"

Bacon: *"They take trees which by law they cannot do"* (p. 184.)

Henry: "We must not rend our subjects from our laws"
". . . . Why we take
From every tree lop, bark, and part o' the timber;
And, though we leave it with a root, thus hack'd,
The air will drink the sap"
(Lines 93 & 95.)

Bacon: *All these great misdemeanors are committed in and under your Majesty's name* (p. 186.)

Katharine: "The King our master . . . even he escapes not"
(Line 25.)

Bacon: *"We hope your Majesty will hold them twice guilty that commit these offences, once for the oppressing of the people . . ."* (p. 186.)

This oppression of the people is what Bacon complained of in his speech (1593) against the granting of three subsidies, payable in four years:—

"The danger is this: we (shall thus) breed discontentment in the people. And in cause of jeopardy, her Majesty's safety must consist more in the love of her people than in their wealth. And therefore (we should beware) not to give them cause of discontentment."
(*Life, I*, p. 223.)

This *"love of her people"* brings us back to the fable of *"Briareus with his hundred hands."* and to "Bid him strive to gain the love o' the commonality."
(See October issue of BACONIANA.)

The safety of the crown in this speech is also expressed

in the petition to King James; so is the safety of King Henry in the scene we are dealing with.

Equally important is the solicitude for the poor people expressed in all three; and reinforced, after the subsidy speech, in Bacon's letter to Burghley:—

> "*It is true from the beginning, whatsoever was above a double subsidy, I did wish might* (*for precedent's sake*) *appear to be extraordinary*," (*Life, I*, p. 234); because, as he says in his subsidy speech, "*Other princes hereafter will look for the like; so we shall put an ill precedent upon ourselves and to our posterity.*" (*Ib.*, p. 223.)

It is clear, then, that in Elizabeth's time there was no precedent for "three subsidies, payable in four years"; neither was there any precedent in Henry's time for Wolsey's "sixth part of each to be levied without delay;" hence Henry's question and exclamation:

> "A sixth part of each? A trembling contribution!"
> (*H8, I*, 2, 95.)

Bacon's letter to Burghley continued:—
"*and* (*for discontent's sake*) *mought not be levied upon the poorer sort.*"

This defending of the poor against oppressive taxations and exactions was one of Bacon's greatest virtues. Even as late as 1621 he wrote: "*The state and bread of the poor and oppressed have been precious in mine eyes.*"
(*Life, VII*, p. 230.)

This same virtue is equally marked in "Shakespeare," pleading for the poor, "Compell'd by hunger and lack of other means," in the scene we are dealing with, and also in 'King Lear' (*III*, 4, 35):

> "Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel,
> That thou may'st shake the superflux to them."

And again in Bacon's History of Henry VII:—

> "*For matter of treasure, let it not be taken from the poorest sort, but from those to whom the benefit of the war may redound.*" (*Works, VI*, p. 119.)

Regarding the raising of money for the state, Bacon tells us that a wholesome law is one that does not cause discontentment among the "general commonalty," and by consequence no danger to the crown; and therefore a law which is not wholesome is one that produces the exact opposite conditions; and such were the conditions which Wolsey created by excessive taxation of the people; and as, in the scene we are dealing with, the people "are all in uproar and danger serves among them," it is easy to understand what Katharine means when she says to Wolsey: "But you frame things . . . which are not wholesome to those that would know them, and yet must perforce be their acquaintance." (*H8*, *I*, 2, 44.) The word "wholesome", applied to laws, occurs again in that ironical speech in Coriolanus:

> "Repeal daily any wholesome act established against the rich, and provide more piercing statutes to chain up and restrain the poor."
>
> (*I*, 1, 84.)

But this word "wholesome", applied to laws, is much more common in Bacon's works as the following quotations will show:—

> *"Look into the state of your laws and justice of your land; purge out multiplicity of laws, clear the incertainty of them, repeal those that are snaring, and press the execution of those that are wholesome and necessary."*
>
> (*Life*, *I*, p. 339.)

> *"The cessation and abstinance to execute these unnecessary laws doth mortify the execution of such as are wholesome and most meet to be put in execution both for your Majesty's profit and the universal benefit of the realm."*
>
> (*Works*, *VII*, p. 315, note.)

> *"Penal laws obsolete and out of use . . . bring a gangrene, neglect and habit of disobedience upon other wholesome laws that are fit to be continued in practice and execution."*
>
> (*Life*, *VI*, p. 65.)

> *"To devise, confirm, and quicken good and wholesome laws."*
>
> (*Hist. Henry VII*, *Works*, *VI*, p. 80.)

and again on page 85:

"The lasting fruit of Parliament, which is good and wholesome laws."

The reason for staying so long upon this particular scene in Henry VIII is because of the obvious reference to Bacon's commentary upon Ecclesiastes X, 1; and whenever we come upon a reference to this parable, as we do in twelve of the plays and in Lucrece, we find other reminders of Bacon not far away; and in seventy-seven lines of this short scene we find no less than twenty-six of them; some taken from the two essays; some from the two speeches and one or two from elsewhere; and, as already stated, Bacon's two essays, IX and XV, which have been drawn upon so extensively in this and the previous issue of BACONIANA, were not published before 1625, and his petition to James was not published before 1657 in Dr. Rawley's first edition of the Resuscitatio (*Works, VII*, p. 114). It is clear therefore that William of Stratford who died in 1616 could not have seen the essays nor the petition and could not have borrowed from them.

This argument applies also to the Earl of Oxford, who died in 1604; to the Earl of Rutland, who died in 1612; to Beaumont, who died in 1616; to Fletcher, who died in 1625; and to the sixth earl of Derby, who died even later. If any of these men had lived till 1650 it would have made no difference, because not one of them could have seen the printed essays or petition in time to make use of them in a play that must have been written two years before 1625, otherwise it could not have appeared in the first folio of November 1623.

The only man to whom this argument does not apply is Francis Bacon; for he is the only man who had no need to await the printing of his own work in order to make use of it even twenty years before 1625.

If the "more intelligent critics" (words which they apply to themselves) insist upon assigning this scene to Shakespeare, then, I say, this Shakespeare could not be William of Stratford-on-Avon.

(*To be continued.*)

THE BACON AND SHAKSPERE MOTTOES.

By Bertram G. Theobald.

STUDY of the Bacon and Shakspere mottoes provides a striking illustration of the fact that Francis Bacon and his associates repeatedly constructed secret devices for the purpose of recording the following two facts:

(a) that he was the true "Shakespeare."

(b) that his parents were Queen Elizabeth and Robert Earl of Leicester.

For an understanding of these devices it is sufficient to know that, where numerical ciphers are concerned, the undermentioned varieties were systematically employed:

	A	B	C	IJ	K	L	UV	Z
Simple cipher	1	2	3	9	10	11	20	24
Reverse cipher	24	23	22	16	15	14	5	1
K cipher	27	28	29	35	10	11	20	24

By this means any required word could be represented by the sum of the numerical equivalents of its letters. Thus:

B	A	C	O	N	
2	1	3	14	13=33=	Bacon (S) i.e. in Simple cipher

S H A K E S P E A R E

18 34 27 10 31 18 15 31 27 17 31=259 (K) i.e. in K cipher and so for any other word.

The motto adopted by Sir Nicholas Bacon was *Mediocria firma*; and as he possessed this before Francis was born, any cryptography revealed in these words would naturally have no evidential value.

When a grant of arms was made in 1599 to William Shakspere's father John, the motto associated with this, though not an integral part of the arms, was "Non sanz droict." If we remember that at this time both the Earl

of Essex and the learned William Camden held office at the College of Heralds, it is easy to understand that their friend Francis Bacon would have no difficulty in arranging that Shakspere's motto should contain a hidden allusion to the authorship secret. This, I am convinced, was done, thus:

Non sanz droict (R)=163=F. Bacon-W. Shakespeare (S)
or: Bacon is Shakespeare (S)

a sly hint which must have caused no little merriment among those who were cognisant of the facts. But there is much more in it than this; for those three words were carefully chosen in order to reveal the names of Bacon's parents. Now it so happens that

Mediocria (S)= 74=Robert (S)
Mediocria firma (S)=119=Leycester (R)

and, as already remarked, no weight as evidence can be attached to this in the present enquiry. It is a genuine coincidence—that word which sceptics so love to use when they wish to discredit cipher devices, even those which must have been carefully planned! But notice how adroitly Bacon made use of this coincidence; for, by combining his family motto with the one chosen for Shakspere, the following remarkable results appear:

firma, Non (K)=163=F. Bacon-W. Shakespeare (S)
or Bacon is Shakespeare (S)
Mediocria firma, Non (S)=159=Francis Tudor (R)
firma, Non sanz (R)=159=Francis Tudor (R)
firma, Non sanz (S)=141=Francis Tudor (S)
Non sanz (K)=122=Parent (K)
Mediocria (S)= 74=Robert (S)
Mediocria firma (S)=119=Leycester (R)
sanz droict (S)=122=Parent (K)
droict (S)= 66=Queen (R)
droict (R)= 84=Elizabeth (S)
firma, Non sanz droict (S)=207=Queen Elizabeth (R)

Thus, not only is "F. Bacon-W. Shakespeare" repeated, but a categorical statement as to Bacon's parentage is given; and we see that as "Robert" and "Leycester" had already been provided by "coincidence," Francis

now added "Queen" and "Elizabeth" to make the tale complete; the word "Parent" being applicable in both cases, and occurring twice in order to emphasise this fact. Altogether this is a most ingenious and telling piece of cryptography.

When Francis Bacon was created Viscount St. Alban in 1621, he took the additional motto *Moniti meliora*, and it soon becomes clear that these words, like *Non sanz droict*, must have been selected with the utmost care, for analysis of them shows:

Moniti (S) = 76 = Robert (R)
Moniti (R) = 74 = Robert (S)
meliora (R) = 106 = Leycester (S)
Moniti meliora (R) = 180 = Robert Leycester (S)

thus cleverly repeating the truth as to one of his parents. Not only so, but if the two Bacon mottoes be combined we find in the first place a plain declaration that he was, in a literary sense, the author "William Shakespeare," thus:

Mediocria firma, Moniti meliora (S) = 264 = Bacon-Shakespeare (R)
Mediocria firma, Moniti meliora (R) = 411 = William Shakespeare (K)

and secondly, in *addition* to what is revealed by *Moniti meliora*, we have:

firma (R) = 80 = Parent (R)
Mediocria firma, Moniti (S) = 195 = Robert Leycester (R)

again stressing the fact that Robert Leycester was his father, as once more the word "Parent" appears.

Having already combined Shakspere's *Non sanz droict* with the Bacon family motto, the next thing is to combine it with Bacon's own motto *Moniti meliora*. Analysis shows:

Moniti meliora, Non sanz (R) = 259 = Shakespeare (K)
Moniti meliora, Non sanz (S) = 241 = Francis Bacon-Francis Tudor
meliora, Non (R) = 141 = Francis Tudor (S)
meliora, Non (K) = 187 = Prince of Wales (R)

Once more there is an allusion to the authorship of "Shakespeare," as also to Bacon's royal parentage. The name Francis Tudor has already appeared many times, but here it is linked with Francis Bacon to give still more point; and to avoid any possible doubt, we are indirectly

but clearly told that he was the eldest son of Queen Elizabeth and Leicester, and that consequently the title "Prince of Wales" was his lawful birthright.

Pursuing this enquiry to its logical conclusion, we must now combine all three mottoes, to see what further information, if any, may be revealed. Here are the results:

firma, Moniti meliora,
Non sanz droict. (R)=423=F. Bacon-W. Shakespeare (K)
or: Bacon is Shakespeare (K)

Mediocria firma
Moniti meliora
Non sanz droict. (S)=426=Francis Bacon Knight (K)
Last letters of these words (K)=172=Shakespeare (R)

There is nothing far-fetched in the interpretations assigned to the various numbers here shown, since all these numbers are quite familiar to the Baconian cryptographer from his general experience, and the method employed is precisely on the same lines as may be seen in scores of other examples in the literature of those times. By such simple means, and in this very small compass, highly important facts have been disclosed, and the whole message hangs together, forming an intelligent statement upon two definite subjects. Can anyone still talk about "coincidence?"

THOMAS RANDOLPH AND FRANCIS BACON.

By R. L. Eagle.

IN a poem called "A Complaint against Cupid," by Thomas Randolph (1605-1635), printed in Hazlitt's edition of his Plays and Poems, occur these lines:

> Besides, each day I'll write an elegy
> And in as lamentable poetry
> As any Inns-of-Court man, that hath gone
> To bind an Ovid with a Littleton.

Hazlitt has the following note to this passage:

> "A curious illustration of this passage was supplied some time ago by a book-collector meeting in the country with a copy of 'Lucrece' (1594) bound up in a volume with some law tracts."

Hazlitt's edition was published in 1875.

It is probable that Randolph had a particular Inns-of-Court man in mind rather than it having been a custom for members to have bound up poems with their law books. It is a coincidence that "Lucrece" should have a considerable section of the poem occupied with the *lament* of the heroine, and further that its foundation should be Ovid. There is a well-known illustration of the law student combining his studies with the writing of poems and plays in the first act of Ben Jonson's "Poetaster." The character is named Ovid, but he represents a lawyer-poet at the date when the play was written. He writes for the public stage secretly and anonymously, and it has been demonstrated most convincingly that "Ovid" is Francis Bacon.*

As D. Plunket Barton ("The History of the Inns of Court," p. 192) points out, the members of the Inns of Court found their chief recreation in the writing and producing of plays. Many of the fine plays which found their way to the playhouses had their origin here. The

* "Is it Shakespeare?" By the Rev. Walter Begley (John Murray, 1903.)

frequent use of legal terms and phraseology helps to proclaim it. Dr. Plunket Barton says:

> "Such were the relaxations (plays, Masques and Revels) in which the young members of Gray's Inn whiled away their leisure hours in the time of Queen Elizabeth. In those days the Inn was not only a college for lawyers and a rendezvous for prominent servants of the State. It was also a nursery of poets, dramatists and men-of-letters."

Randolph was educated at Westminster (Ben Jonson's school) and proceeded to Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he became M.A. As this was Bacon's college, he would have formed an interest in its famous son. On Bacon's death in 1626, he wrote a long Latin elegy as a contribution to "Manes Verulamiani," published in the same year. The elegy is included in Hazlitt's edition of Randolph's works. It was Randolph who said of Bacon that "Apollo withheld his healing hand because he feared that Bacon would become King of the Muses." He said, moreover, that it was Bacon who "taught the Pegasean arts to grow." In short, Randolph declared that Bacon was a poet unapproached and unapproachable by any other, ancient or modern. What personal acquaintance there was between them is impossible to say, but Randolph was patronised by Ben Jonson, and Ben Jonson was helping Bacon in literary work between 1621 and 1626. Another link between Bacon and Randolph is to be found in "Manes Verulamiani," as Dr. James Duport, of Trinity College, also contributed an elegy to this collection, saying that "the demi-god of Verulam, such was his passion for writing, filled the world with tomes." Duport wrote a Latin elegy on Randolph's death placing him very highly among the poets of his time. It appears, therefore, that we are in touch with the friends of Bacon's declining years. They were brilliant young men in whom Bacon must have felt hope that they would pass on the torch which he had lit. Had Randolph not been cut off at an early age, he would have achieved much.

I SHALL LAUGH LAST.

THE AMAZING STORY OF A "SHAKESPEARE FIND."

Reprinted from the "Daily Mirror," 21st September, 1937.

"MY Dear Sir,—I have read in the papers that you are taking down that very historical house. Well, I am coming down to tell you that I used to live in that old Priory and that I have and know a secret room just by that long mantel chimney upstairs, and what right have they to pull it down and send it to America? Disgraceful it is, I am your friend . . . ."

"P.S.—Do not tell those nasty newspapers anything; they will rob you of those relics. Plan enclosed."

It is twelve years since I received this letter, but the events that have followed it have made a story stranger than fiction.

In 1925 a controversy arose because a historical Tudor Manor was "going West." An American millionaire had purchased Warwick Priory and was shipping it block by block to America, where it was to be rebuilt as his country home.

Queen Elizabeth had often stayed at Warwick Priory and Shakespeare had presented many of his plays there.

In spite of countless protests, the demolition of the priory went on.

I was working near Warwick Priory at the time and when I received this letter I thought it was a hoax.

But later, when I happened to be in the Priory, I visited the room described in the letter.

The panels WERE hollow.

I took a friend, Bob R——, into my confidence.

Late that night he and I returned to the Priory and, armed with chisels and hammers, we cut through the panels to find a secret chamber near the roof.

Our lantern showed a large chamber filled with books, Bibles, busts, clocks; and on the floor was an oak chest.

That night Bob and I made twenty journeys between the Priory and my cottage, on each trip pushing a barrow laden with our treasure-trove.

The larger articles we placed in my cottage, but the oak chest, which contained old parchments, I buried in my garden.

I found that one of the Bibles had the name William Shakespeare written inside.

I knew we had found a horde of Shakespeare relics.

A year after the last block of Warwick Priory had been shipped abroad, I thought the time safe to start selling what I had found.

My find caused a sensation.

Some experts said that they were fakes.

I became known as "Rogers, King of Fakers; King of Hoaxers."

As a result of the famous Penn and Milton forgeries, I went to goal, where I was known as "the man who wrote Shakespeare."

I sold most of the relics, but all the time the old oak chest was buried in my garden at Warwick.

I went to America. I spent money right and left. In Canada I became know as "Rogers the Philanthropist."

In two years I spent £15,000 and returned to England penniless.

At last I returned to Warwickshire and dug up the oak chest. Once more by lantern light I examined the contents. Then the truth struck me.

I had found many of the original manuscripts of Shakespeare. There were folios from his plays, letters from Bacon, 1,476 pages in all.

The story became public.

The world laughed at me.

"Rogers, the Hoaxer again," they said.

But I kept silent. To speak would have meant that the contents of the oak chest would have been taken from me.

Then a famous American Shakespearean authority came to me.

He proved that I was a grandson of Mary Hornby, who was a descendent of John Hart, Shakespeare's sister.

A month later, we came to an agreement. I took the American to Warwickshire and dug up the oak chest.

He was almost crazy with excitement.

Next day a deed was drawn up.

By that deed, the Shakesperean manuscripts are to be offered to the American nation after my death and the proceeds are to be apportioned in the way therein stated.

On May 16th, 1937, the oak chest, packed in a large case, was dispatched to Paris. Two days later it was placed on board an American vessel sailing from Cherbourg for New York.

So I have had the last laugh after all. These documents are GENUINE.

And perhaps one day the world may have cause to bless the name of Hunter Charles Rogers.

OBITUARY.

We regret to announce the death of one of the early members of the Bacon Society, Miss E. Leith, who died at the advanced age of 97 on the 26th September last.

She interested herself in the cause of the blind for many years before she herself lost her sight and was privileged to open and to carry on by her own charitable efforts the first Braille library, now one of the most important branches of the National Society for the blind.

She was the author of a volume of poems entitled *Thoughts and Remembrances* and her verse was set to music.

She was the sister of Miss A. A. Leith, one of the Bacon Society's Vice-Presidents, still happily with us, and eight years her junior.

REVIEWS.

THE MARRIAGE OF QUEEN ELIZABETH. By Alfred Dodd. (Rider, 12*s*. 6*d*.)

Mr. Dodd has certainly said all there is to be said in support of the theory that Queen Elizabeth was first the mistress and afterwards the wife of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and that the children of their union were Francis Bacon and Robert, Earl of Essex.

He has consulted a great number of authorities and his book has obviously been written with painstaking care as well as with enthusiasm. His argument is addressed to the reader, and upon it the reader must pronounce whether the author has established his case or not.

This is by no means an easy matter. Evidence is often conflicting, contemporary statements are ambiguous and were possibly only made to mislead; the conduct of the parties is difficult to interpret and seems occasionally to support and at other times to negative what has come to be known as the Royal Birth theory.

Those who accept it will find justification for their faith in Mr. Dodd's pages; sceptics will find matter for consideration. It is to be hoped that the courage of the author and of his publishers in these unpropitious times will be rewarded by the purchase by both classes of readers of a very readable book indeed.

SHAKSPERE AND HIS PREDECESSORS. By Frederick S. Boas. (London: John Murray, 8*s*. 6*d*. net.)

In his introductory chapter to the seventh reprinting of his book, first published in 1896, the author assumes it still has a useful purpose to fulfil. He does not, however, indicate what this may be: indeed he writes "as to its critical aspects, even were I inclined to modify my views, I would consider it inexpedient to make alterations in the text," the reason for this being that his views "have the unity that springs from an approach to their subject at a particular period with its distinctive influences."

The forty-four year old approach to the subject is really that of orthodox criticism and commentary to-day and Dr. Boas need not apologise for it. He is in excellent company for the mandarin Professors, as Frank Harris used to call them, are returning one by one to the eighteenth century.

Some of them even claim the original Shakespearian authorship of all the *Henry VI* plays, and even *Titus Andronicus* and the pathetic stampede "back to the Folio," as the late Mr. J. H. Robinson used to call it, is again apparent on every side.

However, Dr. Boas is modern enough to mention the "gentle" Shakspere in the unexpected light thrown upon him by the writ of attachment issued against him and two women at the suit of William Waite, but he is hailing a dawn that rose as long ago as

1910 when he writes of Professor Wallace of Nebraska, exhibiting the dramatist in an attractive, but again an unexpected, light, deposing that one Belott was a good and industrious servant and that at the entreaty of Mrs. Mountjoy he had moved and persuaded Belott to conclude a marriage.

Dr. Boas thinks it curious to hear of the dramatist in 1612 near the close of his career, being spoken of as Mr. Shakespeare in the Belott and Mountjoy suit. Perhaps this is not as curious as Dr. Boas thinks. The other deponents may not have had the author of "Hamlet" in mind—only Mr. William Shakspere of Stratford-on-Avon in the County of Warwick, gentleman, of the age of 48 or thereabouts, who signs himself Willm Shaks.

Dr. Boas finds the problems of the Sorrows of Shakespeare provocative and insoluble. They will remain so while he looks to the successful maltster moneylender and speculator in Stratford land for traces of "the disillusion and despondency that followed Essex's downfall, Gloriana's death and the mental strain and sometimes exhaustion" (Sir R. Chambers) and "the dominant mood of gloom and dejection which on one occasion at least brought him to the verge of madness" (Professor Dover Wilson).

Further, Dr. Boas thinks the folio editors too sweeping and Professor Pollard right: there are good and bad quartos of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*. Eminent palaeographers think three leaves in the play *Sir Thomas Moore* are in Shakespeare's autograph and so on. Readers of BACONIANA will know what to expect. The more orthodox criticism changes the more it is the same thing.

Bacon is mentioned on four occasions: "the spirit of the Renaissance inspired his clarion call to the conquest of all knowledge": he closed, like Leicester, Essex and Raleigh, Greene, Marlowe, Spenser and Jonson, his days amid disaster or disgrace: he describes the piece bespoken ay the followers of Essex as the play of the deposing of King Richard II, and finally we are told that *Hamlet* is a picture of the same society as is reflected in Spenser's *Mother Hubberd's Tale*, and in some of Bacon's most typical Essays. We may be permitted to wonder once more how much of Shakespeare's work our modern Shakespearians have ever read.

CORRESPONDENCE.

29, The Circus, Bath.

To the Editors, BACONIANA.

Dear Sirs,

Baconians will derive little benefit from Professor Oscar James Campbell's article in the July issue of *Harper's Magazine*. He repeats the old story of Delia Bacon, who died insane, and leaves us to infer that other Baconians must also be insane. Our English asylums are full of mad people, who are nearly all members of the Stratford faction; and he directs our minds to a passage in the plays from which we may infer that his own idol was akin to a lunatic:

> "The lunatic, the lover and the poet
> Are of imagination all compact."

I have seen one of our most popular poets in a state of trembling delirium caused by alcohol, during which time his mind bodied forth the forms of things unknown to those about him; and another man of great intelligence in a similar state from a disease which is rapidly fatal or rapidly cured; but what has this to do with the product of their saner periods? If Euclid had died mad what difference would it have made to the truth, and therefore to the charm, of his intellectual output?

Professor Campbell compares Bacon in serious mood with Shakespeare while playing the fool; could anything be more unreasonable? He thinks Shakespeare's knowledge was not exceptional, while the editors of our English dictionaries think the exact opposite. He also thinks that Bacon who published one small volume between 1560 and 1605 was too busy to write the thirty-eight dramas attributed to Shakespeare, but he does not tell us how he was employed during these forty-four years.

He makes it quite clear that he has not read the whole of Bacon's works and letters. A short course in comparative anatomy would have taught him that we cannot compare two minds without a knowledge of both.

The twenty-six columns which the professor contributes to *Harper's Magazine* are intended to prove that the seventeenth earl of Oxford was not the author of the plays, but that William of Stratford was; he might have disposed of the Oxfordians in a few lines, thus:

1. The earl died in 1604.
2. The plays of the first folio were in the hands of the printers by September 1623.
3. The principal author of these plays borrowed from the new material in a book which was first published on the 13th of October 1623. This is a fact which has never been denied, and never can be denied, by those who speak the truth.

It is clear, then, that the earl could not have seen or borrowed from this book, and therefore could not have been the principal author of the plays. This same argument casts down the professor's own idol, for William of Stratford died in 1616.

The only man that can borrow from the new material of a book before it is published is the author of the book, and, as that author was Francis Bacon, he must of necessity be the principal author of the plays.

Why, then, were we ever so foolish as to believe in William of Stratford? The answer may be summed up in the one word "gullibility." Just as "Shakespeare" wrote "Beef-witted Lord," so Nashe wrote "ice-brained beef-witted gull," and Nashe thought that the English people were amongst the most gullible in the world. Certain it is that the beef-witted gulls of Elizabeth's time had no notion who wrote the plays, and Professor Campbell gives a reason for this:—"As a matter of fact the Elizabethan audience had no more interest in the author of the drama than we have in the men who write our movie scenarios." However, there were gossips in those days as there are in these, and the gossips of Elizabeth's time were gulled into believing that "Shakespeare" represented William of Stratford, and the gulls of to-day are descended from them; and so, as Bacon says, "We see the weakness and credulity of men is such, as they will often prefer a mountebank or witch before a learned physician. And therefore the poets were clear-sighted in discerning this extreme folly when they made Aesculapius and Circe brother and sister."

The professor thinks that those who do not agree with him "lack training." But the great lawyers, mathematicians and scientists who believe that Bacon wrote the plays, make a plausible excuse for some of these masters of English. They argue that they must needs sail over such a vast sea of literature that they have not the time to anchor long enough in one place to become familiar with their surroundings and this seems to be the trouble with Professor Oscar James Campbell.

Yours faithfully,
W. S. Melsome.

To the Editor, Baconiana.
Dear Sir,

There is a copy of the First Folio of Shakespeare with marginal notes in the possession of the University of Padua. When visiting Italy some years ago, I was urged by our President at the time, Sir John Coburn, to inspect it, if possible. I wrote to ask leave to do this, but was refused.

I think our Society should not forget the existence of that Folio.

Yours faithfully,
Alicia A. Leith.

The Editor, Baconiana.
Dear Sir,

Heredom.

Your correspondent, Mr. W. A. Vaughan, in the last number of Baconiana, has set your readers a number of stiff problems.

He revels in unusual terminology. He equates letters, whatever that may mean, and traverses aeons, millenia and centuries with a facile, aerobatic pen that compels admiration, but hardly carries conviction.

Is not the problem of HERE-DOM a comparatively simple one? Both meaning and origin seem so to me. The word alludes to the eternal cult of the "DROIT DU PLUS FORT." This goes back to prehistory or further. You will find its sign-manual for example in the primitive polychrome paintings, sculptures, mouldings in the subterranean galeries of the Pyrenees, in Ariège and elsewhere. These dateless masterpieces of ntral aartists prove that cubists,

vorticists, painters in pointillé, and symbolists generally were none of them inventors, but merely renovators and would-be dominators. The domination the modern cubists sought to achieve by their art, the priests of Isis, the Shamans of the underground waterways strove for mainly by mysterious ritual or maybe by a combination of pictorial art and the spoken word with its echoing peals. All had one aim: MASTER-Y!

Shall I err greatly if I seek in these various manifestations the explanation of the vocable HEREDOM?

He who attains to the majestic CLEF, as Bacon would say of the Rosicrucian 18° (or is it the 33°) is surely an

HEIR

to and inheritor of the supreme mastery, the splendour and knowledge of the sublime mystery; the secret of the most certain immortality on this side of the Western Divide:—that of the race!

If so, the word HEREDOM may divide into two simple component parts:—*her*(*e*) and *-dom*. The former I take to be derived from the Spoken Latin HEREM, which corresponds to the classical accusative *heredem*. Herem with its loosely attached case ending occurs in Joinville as *hoir* and, of course, in English as *heir*.

That is not quite all. The word *heredom* has surely been contaminated by the similarity of sound which it bears with the German HERR (LORD or MASTER) and the coincidental similarity of meaning.

As to the suffix -dom, it will suffice to compare it with King*dom*; the German Herzog*tum* and other like forms.

Your obedient Servant,

All Saints' Day, 1940. SALVAMEN.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

The historic Middle Temple Hall which was opened by Queen Elizabeth in 1577 and in which *Twelfth Night* was played has been seriously damaged by a bomb, one end of the beautiful building having been completely wrecked. The Inner Temple Hall, close by, had been previously bombed and there is now scarcely a building in these ancient Inns of Court which does not bear marks of Nazi destruction.

According to the *Daily Telegraph*, the bomb that damaged the Middle Temple Hall fell on the opposite side of Middle Temple Lane. The double hammered beam roof, one of the finest in the country, and the famous panelling have been damaged. The Minstrels' Gallery has gone and debris fell on the serving table said to have been made from Drake's ship *The Golden Hind*.

Crown Office Row, where Charles Lamb was born, has also had a damaging visit.

Brick Court, where Oliver Goldsmith died, has had roofs damaged and windows smashed, and the rooms where the author of *The Vicar of Wakefield* was visited by Dr. Jonson have now no windows.

The *Daily Telegraph* incidentally refers to the performance of *Twelfth Night* by "Shakespeare's own company," once more promoting the "man-player" and "deserving man" and shareholder to the position of owner-manager which, of course, he never was.

John Manningham's Diary, which is the source of our information, does not mention the name of the author nor indicate whether the comedy was performed by professionals or by the Middle Templars themselves, who, like Sir Andrew Aguecheek, delighted in masques and revels.

Writing to *Notes and Queries*, W.P.D. enquires whether any reader can throw light on the obscure line in *The Phoenix and the Turtle*, "the breath thou giv'st and tak'st." W.P.D. points out that no one ever understood this who was not acquainted with the passage in Pliny (*Hist. Nat.*, xiii, 4) about the tree on which the Phoenix is supposed to perch, dying with the tree and renewing itself as the tree is renewed. W.P.D. points out that if this is so it would seem to follow that Shakespeare knew Pliny, perhaps knew him in the original. What translations in the "History would be available to him?

Describing the Cabinet Room at No. 10, Downing Street, in *John o' London*, in which the King's Cabinet Ministers meet for the ruling of the State as a room with an air of spaciousness and solid comfort, to which four Corinthian columns across its width add a touch of dignity, Guy Russell writes that only a solitary picture graces the walls, that of Francis Bacon, First Lord St. Albans. Is this generally known? It would appear to be an unique honour.

The article by the late Mr. Parker Woodward in the last

issue of BACONIANA, describing the *Shrewsbury* M.S., has attracted a certain amount of attention in the press, but no acknowledgment has been made to our pages.

The *News Review*, November 14th, published a column under the caption "Mother Elizabeth" and concluded by espressing the opinion of the librarian of Shrewsbury School that the tattle found in the Dychar bible was written by a schoolboy.

It would appear to be a curious entry for a schoolboy to make in any circumstances.

Shakespeare's plays are being performed in more than 200 Soviet theatres, and fifty new productions are scheduled for this season. Most popular Shakespeare play in Russia is *Othello*, which last year was included in the repertoire of sixty-seven theatres. Next most popular is *Romeo and Juliet*.

From the *Western Daily Press and Bristol Mirror*, 16th December, 1940.

"Let England," wrote Coleridge in one of his notebooks, "be Sir Philip Sidney, Shakespeare, Milton, Bacon, Harrington, Swift, Wordsworth."

Of these it has been said that Bacon "dug deep that after ages might pile high." An edition of Bacon's works, published 200 years ago, in 1740, is on exhibition in the Reference Library, College Green, this week.

Bacon was endowed by Nature with the richest gifts and most extraordinary powers, and it was his desire to create a new system of philosophy on a right interpretation of Nature.

In 1605 he presented to King James an English treatise, "The Advancement of Learning," but not until 1620, on the eve of his fall, did he publish the "Novum Organum."

These are his principal philosophical works, and in them he deals with the field of knowledge as if he "stood on a cliff and surveyed the whole of nature." In the "New Atlantis" Bacon is seen at his best, and had he written no more than his Essays they would have bequeathed his name undying to posterity.